

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

HANSHOW TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.

Plaintiff,

v.

SES-IMAGOTAG SA and SESIMAGOTAG
GMBH,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:23-CV-00174-RWS-RSP

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants' Partial Motion to Dismiss the Nokia Patent Allegations (Counts II and III) Under FRCP 12(b)(6). Docket No. 55. Magistrate Judge Payne entered a Report and Recommendation recommending the denial of Defendants' motion. Docket No. 100.


Because no objections have been received, Plaintiff is barred from *de novo* review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. *See Duarte v. City of Lewisville, Texas*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017); *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, Case No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined the report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 100) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that Defendants' Partial Motion to Dismiss the Nokia Patent Allegations (Counts II and III) Under FRCP 12(b)(6) (Docket No. 55) is **DENIED**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of October, 2024.


ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE